

## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Meeks, Timothy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:08 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

claims 26-41 would go to 427/359 if elected.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:00 AM  
**To:** Meeks, Timothy  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 26-35 are best examined in your AU?

*Betelhem Shewareged*

*Patent Examiner (Primary)*  
*571-272-1529*  
*AU 1774*

## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 4:38 PM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

If you make a proper restriction.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 4:14 PM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Cc:** Shosho, Callie  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Callie agrees with you regarding the dependent claims 49-51. Will you accept claims 48 and 52-58 if elected in the future? Claims 48 and 52-58 can not be classified in 428/402 because particle size has not been claimed.

Thank You!  
Betelhem

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 12:40 PM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

No problem. You have a good point. Latex is an aqueous dispersion of particles. In this case, these particles have a hard core/soft shell structure. Particles as such fall out in 428/402. The problem is that even if you construe claim 48 as reading on a composition there are dependent claims that recite limitations having to do with permeability (claim 49), coating density (50), etc. which take it beyond mere composition. Furthermore, there are more comprehensive claims 59-70 to a receptive substrate which does have a multi-layered structure. Placement of this case will be controlled by the latter. Coating does not control. Why don't you talk to Callie? Maybe she has a different viewpoint.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:30 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry, it is me again.

The core-sheet is not an article it is a latex (see [0015] and [0024]-[0028]) formed by emulsion polymerization technique (see [0030]-[0036]).

Don't you think the microporous coating is a composition not an article?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:15 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

It is a core-shell type of article. No composition here.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:03 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

How about claims 48-58, they are directed to microporous coating?  
Thanks!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:50 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry not for 1714. My response in red.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:08 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 42-58 ("means" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? I believe claims 49-51 (Multi-layered coating is not a composition. Not for 1714) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Would you **also** check if claims 1-13 ("System" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? **Again**, I believe claims 11-13 ("system" is apparatus. Claim recites coated substrate which is not a composition) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Thank You!

*Betelhem Shewareged*

Patent Examiner (Primary)  
571-272-1529  
AU 1774

## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Nguyen, Thinh  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 4:28 PM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Yes they are.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 4:23 PM  
**To:** Nguyen, Thinh  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 20 and 21 are best Examined in your AU? (for restriction)  
Thank You!

*Betelhem Shewareged*

*Patent Examiner (Primary)*  
*571-272-1529*

*AU 1774*

## **Shewareged, Betelhem**

---

**From:** Shosho, Callie  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 3:07 PM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem

Hi Betelhem

10/813,772 - For a restriction, I think claims 14 and 15 would be classified in 524/425.

10/801,356 - I think the claims would belong in class 106 because the ink has a non-polymeric compound.

10/789,963 - I do not think these claims would be classified in our area.

Callie

## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 12:40 PM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

No problem. You have a good point. Latex is a an aqueous dispersion of particles. In this case, these particles have a hard core/soft shell structure. Particles as such fall out in 428/402. The problem is that even if you construe claim 48 as reading on a composition there are dependent claims that recite limitations having to do with permeability (claim 49), coating density (50), etc. which take it beyong mere composition. Furthermore, there are more comprehensive claims 59-70 to a receptive substrate which does have a multi-layered structure. Placement of this case will be controlled by the latter. Coating does not control. Why don't you talk to Callie? Maybe she has a different viewpoint.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:30 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry, it is me again.

The core-sheet is not an article it is a latex (see [0015] and [0024]-[0028]) formed by emulsion polymerization technique (see [0030]-[0036]).  
Don't you think the microporous coating is a composition not an article?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:15 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

It is a core-shell type of article. No composition here.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:03 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

How about claims 48-58, they are directed to microporous coating?  
Thanks!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:50 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry not for 1714. My response in red.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:08 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 42-58 ("means" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? I believe claims 49-51 ( Multi-layered coating is not a composition. Not for 1714) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Would you **also** check if claims 1-13 ("System" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? **Again**, I believe claims 11-13 ("system" is apparatus. Claim recites coated substrate which is not a composition) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Thank You!

*Betelhem Shewareged*

*Patent Examiner (Primary)*

*571-272-1529*

*AU 1774*

## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:15 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

It is a core-shell type of article. No composition here.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 11:03 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

How about claims 48-58, they are directed to microporous coating?  
Thanks!

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:50 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry not for 1714. My response in red.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:08 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 42-58 ("means" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? I believe claims 49-51 (Multi-layered coating is not a composition. Not for 1714) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Would you **also** check if claims 1-13 ("System" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? **Again**, I believe claims 11-13 ("system" is apparatus. Claim recites coated substrate which is not a composition) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Thank You!

*Betelhem Shewareged*

Patent Examiner (Primary)  
571-272-1529  
AU 1774



## Shewareged, Betelhem

---

**From:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:50 AM  
**To:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Subject:** RE: 10/789,963

Sorry not for 1714. My response in red.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Shewareged, Betelhem  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 04, 2006 10:08 AM  
**To:** Jagannathan, Vasu  
**Subject:** 10/789,963

Would you check if claims 42-58 ("means" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? I believe claims 49-51 (Multi-layered coating is not a composition. Not for 1714) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Would you **also** check if claims 1-13 ("System" is apparatus. Not for 1714) are best examined in your AU? **Again**, I believe claims 11-13 ("system" is apparatus. Claim recites coated substrate which is not a composition) are directed to composition too, would you take a look at them closely?

Thank You!

*Betelhem Shewareged*

Patent Examiner (Primary)  
571-272-1529  
AU 1774